(handwritten: S~)

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/652,360	08/31/2000	Leon Wong	13768.135.2	4462

22913	7590	12/02/2003	

WORKMAN NYDEGGER (F/K/A WORKMAN NYDEGGER &
SEELEY)
60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE
1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111

EXAMINER
ZHONG, CHAD

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	3

DATE MAILED: 12/02/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/652,360	WONG ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Chad Zhong	2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _14 November 2002_ .

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1-27_ is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) _1-27_ is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

     If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

         1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

         2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

         3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

     a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .	6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-27 are presented for examination.

2.   The specification is objected to because current US patent policy does not permit the use of

hyperlinks in the specification. Such links are directed to an Internet site, the contents of which are

subject to change without notice. Therefore, the potential for inclusion of new matter would be a constant

problem. See page 21-22, for example. Correction is required.

3   The oath or declaration is defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance with 37

CFR 1.67(a) identifying this application by application number and filing date is required. See MPEP

§§ 602.01 and 602.02.

    The oath or declaration is defective because:

    It does not state that the person making the oath or declaration believes the named inventor or
    inventors to be the original and first inventor or inventors of the subject matter which is claimed and
    for which a patent is sought.

    It does not state that the person making the oath or declaration has reviewed and understands the
    contents of the specification, including the claims, as amended by any amendment specifically
    referred to in the oath or declaration.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

    The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the
    subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5.   Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to

particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

    a.   The following terms lack antecedent basis:

       i.   the server computer system – claims 1, 9, 10, 18, 26

   b.   The claim language in the following claims is murky or not clearly

understood:

       i.   As per claims 1, 9 and 18, "and/or", line 8, and "using at least" line 12, actually using or

not using?

       ii.   As per claims 5, 14 and 22, it is not clear what is meant by NTLM.

       iii.   As per claims 8, 17, 25, it is not clear as to they are independent claim or dependent

claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102(e) that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United
States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has
fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371 (c) of this title before the invention thereof by
the applicant for patent.

7.   Claims 1-6, 8-15, 17-23, 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Powell, "LPRng-HOWTO".

8.   As per claims 1, 9, 10 and 18, Pang teaches a computer network including a server computer

system network attachable to a plurality of client computer systems. a method of authenticating a subset

of the plurality of client computer systems and/or users thereof, the method comprising the following:

     an act of the server computer system receiving a request from a requesting client computer system,

the request including an instruction identifying the authentication methodology that is to be used when

authenticating the subset of client computer systems and/or users thereof (pg 1, lines 10-11);

an act of the server computer system receiving a request for service from the subset of client

computer systems (pg 2, lines 25-30); and

an act of the server computer system authenticating the subset of the client computer systems using at

least the authentication methodology identified in the instruction (pg 2, lines 25-30).

9.   As per claims 2, 11 and 19, Powell teaches wherein the instruction includes at least an instruction

to accept an assertion authentication method for use in authenticating the subset of client computer

systems (pg 2, lines 34-35).

10.   As per claims 3, 12 and 20, Pang teaches wherein the instruction includes at least an instruction to

accept a basic HTTP authentication method for use in authenticating the subset of client computer

systems (pg 2, lines 34-35).

11.   As per claims 4, 13 and 21 Powell teaches wherein the instruction includes at least an instruction

to accept a digest authentication method for use in authenticating thesubset of client computer systems

(pg 2, lines 34-35).

12.   As per claims 5, 14 and 22, Powell teaches wherein the instruction includes at least an

instruction to accept an NTLM authentication method for use in authenticating the subset of client

computer systems (pg 2, lines 34-35).

13.   As per claims 6, 15 and 23, Powell teaches wherein the subset of client computer systems is a

single client computer system (pg 2, lines 12-13).

14.   As per claims 8, 17 and 25, Powell teaches a computer-readable medium having computer-

executable instructions for performing the acts recited in Claim 1 (pg 2, lines 18-24).

15.   As per claim 26, Powell teaches a computer-readable medium having stored thereon a data

structure having a plurality of fields, the data structure comprising:

    a client identifier field that identifies a subset of client computer systems and/or users thereof that are

connected to a server computer system (pg 2, lines 41-42); and

    an authentication field that identifies one or more authentication methods to be used to the server

computer system when authenticating and of the subset of client computer systems and/or users thereof

(pg 2, line 18, line 32-33).

16.   As per claim 27, Powell teaches wherein the client identifier field identifies a single client

computer system (pg 2, lines 41-42).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

17.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such
> that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having
> ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in
> which the invention was made.

18.   Claims 7, 16, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Powell, US

6,446,204 as applied to claims 1, 9 and 18 above.

19.   As per claims 7, 16 and 24, Pang does not teach wherein the request comprises a data structure

that represents an eXtensible Markup Language (XML) element. However it would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention to include XML element for use in client requests

because doing so would improve the flexibility and versatility of Pang's system by utilizing flexible

development of user-defined document types of XML. XML element would provide a robust, non-

proprietary, persistent, and verifiable file format for the storage and transmission of text and data both on and off the Web; and it removes the more complex options of SGML, making it easier to program for.

Conclusion

20.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The following patents and publications are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to "Methods and systems for selecting methodology for authenticating computer systems on a per computer system or per user basis".

i.	US 6,170,057	Inoue et al.
ii.	US 5,721,780	Ensor et al.
iii.	US 6,470,447	Lambert et al.
iv.	US 6,278,449	Sugiarto et al.
v.	US 6,185, 612	Jensen et al
vi.	US 5,930,804	Yu et al.
vii.	US 5,909,503	Graves et al.
viii.	US 5,875,432	Sehr.
ix.	US 6,446,204	Pang et al.
x.	"SDSS Science Archives Security module API", Gyula P. Szokoly 1996.	
xi.	"Sesame Authentication protocol"	

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chad Zhong whose telephone number is (703) 305-0718. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on 703-305-9678. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this

application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238

for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should

be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

CZ
November 25, 2003

MENG-AL T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100